

and deposit insurance funds? What about regulating the generation, transportation, storage and disposal of toxic, hazardous, and radioactive substances? Without a Federal standard, can each State set its own guidelines for waste disposal, and be free to unload its waste on another? Will this bill threaten water safety regulations? Are those protections that we have worked so long and hard to put in place at risk of being erased? I support the concept of mandate reform, but I have serious problems with this process—the way in which we are forcing this bill through. Its long-term impact is too great and too far reaching to be sacrificed for a short-lived success.

I am voting in favor of final passage of H.R. 5 in support of the communities in my district that have consistently expressed their frustration and concern with underfunded mandates. However, I also want to go on record noting my concerns with mandates reform that moves too quickly and does not take into consideration its far-reaching impact. H.R. 5 must ensure that State and local governments get the help that they need in meeting the financial costs of complying with Federal regulations. But it must also reflect the fact that we must have Federal standards. There are certain protections that cannot be waived or eroded. We must therefore work together to develop legislation that balances our support of these critical protections with consideration for the State and local governments that bear the burden of their implementation.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BREUTER) having assumed the chair, Mr. EMERSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5) to curb the practice of imposing unfunded Federal mandates on States and local governments, to ensure that the Federal Government pays the costs incurred by those governments in complying with certain requirements under Federal statutes and regulations, and to provide information on the costs of Federal mandates on the private sector, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 101, TAOS PUEBLO INDIANS OF NEW MEXICO LAND TRANSFER

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-12) on the resolution (H. Res. 51) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 101) to transfer a parcel of land to the Taos Pueblo Indians of New Mexico, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 400, THE ANAKTUVUK PASS LAND EXCHANGE AND WILDERNESS REDESIGNATION ACT OF 1995

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-13) on the resolution (H. Res. 52) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 400) to provide for the exchange of lands within Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 440, LAND CONVEYANCE IN BUTTE COUNTY, CA

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-14) on the resolution (H. Res. 53) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 440) to provide for the conveyance of lands to contain individuals in Butte County, CA, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEES TO SIT ON TOMORROW, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1995, DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit tomorrow while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: Agriculture; Economic and Educational Opportunities; Transportation and Infrastructure; Judiciary; Science; Resources; Commerce; and International Relations.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no object to these requests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BREUTER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object and I will not object, the minority is not going to object but simply say to the Members of the majority, the distinguished majority leader, that this is certainly the appropriate way to go about this. I think we have had a very fruitful day today, we moved quickly through the bill. In each of the cases, the eight committees that the distinguished majority leader mentioned, there was full consultation with the minority. Everyone signed off on it. We think this is the way to operate. We look forward to operating in this way in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GRIDLOCK

(Mrs. SEASTRAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, when I was elected to this great body just 3 short months ago, I made a commitment to my constituents to fight diligently for the ideas that I believe in and to be just as unrelenting in my fight against those ideas that are not good for my district, my State, and our country.

But I must say that I find the behavior by some Members on the other side of the aisle a bit bizarre. They fight to stall legislation that they eventually vote to pass.

I have maintained that gridlock is not necessarily a bad situation. If you oppose something, try to defeat it with every weapon at your disposal. But when a group purposely stalls a bill simply for partisan gain, that is pretense without principle. Some of the antics on the other side of the aisle make you wonder who is devising their strategy.

We are working for real change. We kept our promises by passing the balanced budget amendment last week and are working this week to pass the unfunded mandates bill that will stop the Federal Government from not only passing the buck, but passing the bill to our States and localities.

Mr. Speaker, we should stop the delaying tactics. The American people want us to end the bickering and go on about the people's business.

□ 1940

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BREWSTER) laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 30, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that my office has received a subpoena for testimony and documents concerning constituent casework. The subpoena was issued by the Superior Court of New Jersey in Morris County.

After consultation with General Counsel, I will determine if compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,
RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN,
Member of Congress.

SERIOUS QUESTIONS ABOUT AUTHORITY UNDER WHICH ACTION WAS TAKEN TO BAIL OUT THE MEXICAN PESO

(Mr. BARR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)